

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 23, 2008, in which claims 1-17 were rejected and claim 18 was indicated as allowable. With this Amendment, claims 1-17 are canceled without prejudice, claim 18 is amended, and claims 19-37 are added. Also with this Amendment, a Replacement Drawing Sheet including amended FIG. 1 is submitted.

Drawings

In the Office Action, the drawing filed on April 28, 2006 was objected to because not all processing objects were labeled. With this Amendment, a Replacement Drawing Sheet amended FIG. 1 is submitted to correct this deficiency and therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested. Amended FIG. 1 contains no new matter.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyazaki et al. (EP Pat. No. 1,193,637, hereinafter Miyazaki '637). With this Amendment, claims 1-17 are canceled without prejudice and therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Miyazaki '637 is, however, discussed below with regards to new claims 19-37; some of which were derived from canceled claims 1-17.

Claim Allowed

In the Office Action, claim 18 was indicated as representing allowable subject matter. Claim 18 is currently amended only to correct minor informalities and formatting issues. The subject matter of claim 18 remains unchanged and thus, claim 18 is allowable.

New Claims

Claims 19-37 present no new matter and are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Furthermore, claims 19-37 are allowable over the prior art of record as described below. Consideration and acceptance of new claims 19-37 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-27 are all derived from allowable claim 18. Claims 19-21 are independent claims that include various combinations of features in additional to the core subject matter of claim 18. Claim 22 also captures the subject matter of claim 18, but is presented as a method claim. Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22, and include other combinations of elements recited in claim 18. Claim 26 is a computer program implementing the method of claim 22.

Claims 27-37 are derived from canceled claims 1-17, rewritten in light of the prior art. Specifically, claim 27 corresponds to claim 1, claim 32 corresponds to claim 2, claim 33 corresponds to claim 8, claim 34 corresponds to claim 11, claim 36 corresponds to claim 16, and claim 37 corresponds to claim 17.

New claims 19-37 are allowable because Miyazaki '637 fails to teach or suggest interaction between a practitioner and a health monitoring system. The monitoring system of Miyazaki '637 gathers data provided by sensors located at a patient terminal device and manages the data as an expert system. The expert system alone organizes the medical data, which can then be viewed by a practitioner located at an administrative terminal. In Miyazaki '637, there is no interaction between the practitioner and the medical information system, but rather passive viewing of medical data. As claimed, the present invention is capable of far more individualization and sophistication because it provides for substantial interaction between a user (often a doctor using a man-machine interface) and the health monitoring system. This capability is recited in independent claims 27, 26 and 27, and is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

First Named Inventor: Bruno Bleines

Application No.: 10/577,499

-14-

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the pending claims (18-37) are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 11/24/08

By: 

Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

AMK